

Argument AGAINST Constitutional Initiative 64 (continued) Exhibit No. 2

our whole political leg! Full and free democratic elections were fought for and paid for by the blood of millions of Americans. We should reject this anti-democratic, anti-American proposal and retain our freedom to choose.

Date 5-12-07
 This measure's **OPPONENTS'** argument and rebuttal were prepared by Senator Chet Blaylock, Representative Sheila Rice, Rick Bartos, Donald Judge, and Senator Bob Brown.

PROPONENTS' rebuttal of the argument opposing Constitutional Initiative 64

CLOUT: Opponents say term limits will curtail "clout" of long-term, career politicians for small states like Montana. Term limits will give our elected officials greater "clout" than they have now because we will elect average citizens to office who share our concerns about the future. Instead of waiting years before they are allowed by senior members to take part in making policy, our term-limited lawmakers will hit the deck running, knowing that their mandate is to make life better for us...not for themselves.

We are not alone in voting on term limits. It is a national movement. Almost every state in the West - including California -- as well as states like Florida, Ohio and Michigan are making the same choice for term limits that we are. Colorado voted in Congressional term limits in 1990.

OUT-OF-STATE MONEY: Opponents say CI-64 is not a grassroots effort in Montana. Over 57,000 Montana voters signed CI-64 petitions. Over \$16,000 has been raised so far within Montana to support CI-64. If you want to question out-of-state money, check the contributor lists of Congressional incumbents over the past decade and learn that a majority of their re-election money has come from out-of-state, special interests.

IS IT LEGAL? Opponents say CI-64 is unconstitutional. The Continuation limits only what government can do, not the people. State term limit drives are an expression of the peoples' right to change government. Plain and simple, CI-64 is legal!

OPPONENTS' rebuttal of the argument supporting Constitutional Initiative 64

Montana will soon have only three members of Congress -- about .6% of its membership. If we limit ourselves to whom we can reelect to Congress, the effect on the congressional reelection rate would be almost too small to measure.

However, CI 64 would severely limit the influence of Montana's congressional delegation in the seniority based system of Congress. It makes no sense for Montanans to handicap themselves with term limits when most other states are not even considering doing so. This alone is a powerful reason for rejecting CI 64.

Even the authors of CI 64 concede that in the past eight years the Montana legislature has had a turnover of 57%. In the past seventeen years 97% of the faces have changed. Legislative reelection is

not an issue.

Authors of CI 64 say its passage will dramatically rid government of "game-playing," networking and politicians concerned with reelection. Unfortunately, no such ideal system existed at the time of the founding fathers or at any other time. Citizens, with human strengths and weaknesses, elect our governments and hold our offices. With or without CI 64 our government will be a reflection of us.

Only free people, voting responsibly and intelligently, can properly determine who should hold office and how long they should remain. That is the essential function of a democracy. Our time honored constitutional right to decide whom to elect and reelect should not be infringed. Vote against CI 64.

	For	Against
Beaverhead	2,901	1,110
Big Horn	2,320	1,630
Blaine	1,690	1,102
Broadwater	1,073	346
Carbon	3,089	1,405
Carter	587	236
Cascade	22,733	12,762
Chouteau	2,012	1,153
Custer	3,639	1,849
Daniels	751	509
Dawson	3,210	1,490
Deer Lodge	3,219	1,718
Fallon	993	526
Fergus	4,539	1,804
Flathead	22,072	8,696
Gallatin	20,584	7,245
Garfield	529	231
Glacier	2,780	1,434
Golden Valley	315	141
Granite	898	363
Hill	5,165	2,811
Jefferson	2,863	1,325
Judith Basin	891	534
Lake	7,148	3,028
Lewis & Clark	16,371	8,982
Liberty	745	405
Lincoln	5,931	2,217
Madison	2,371	760
McCone	920	385
Meagher	657	285
Mineral	1,065	533
Missoula	25,856	15,428
Musselshell	1,526	586
Park	4,904	2,329
Petroleum	201	82
Phillips	1,628	859
Pondera	1,932	1,104
Powder River	776	318
Powell	1,903	908
Prairie	537	259
Ravalli	10,672	3,798
Richland	3,033	1,525
Roosevelt	2,643	1,332
Rosebud	2,367	1,459
Sanders	2,906	1,296
Sheridan	1,347	1,153
Silver Bow	11,145	6,398
Stillwater	2,280	1,183
Sweet Grass	1,178	539
Teton	2,040	1,171
Toole	1,798	833
Treasure	371	151
Valley	2,397	1,527
Wheatland	719	390
Wibaux	343	228
Yellowstone	35,611	18,824
Total	264,174	130,695

20 MARGIN

64% 10,000

72% 13,000

63% 10,000

74% 14,500

64% 5,000

65% 17,000

67% 134,000

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 42

AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION PROPOSED BY THE LEGISLATURE

AN ACT SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF MONTANA AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE IV, SECTION 8, OF THE MONTANA CONSTITUTION TO EXTEND TERM LIMITS FOR LEGISLATORS FOR AN ADDITIONAL 4 YEARS; AND PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE.

In 1992, Montana citizens passed a constitutional initiative that limited the number of terms of office Montana legislators and certain executive branch elected officials could serve. This proposal, submitted by the 2003 Legislature, would amend the Montana Constitution to increase the permissible number of terms of office of state representatives and senators. It would increase the permissible terms of office for legislators from 8 years in any 16 year period to 12 years in any 24 year period. This amendment is effective upon approval by the electorate.

- ☐ FOR extending term limits for legislators to 12 years in a 24-year period.
- ☐ AGAINST extending term limits for legislators to 12 years in a 24-year period.

The language above is the official ballot language. The arguments and rebuttals on the following three pages have been prepared by the committees appointed to support or oppose the ballot measure. The opinions stated in the arguments and rebuttals do not necessarily represent the views of the State of Montana. The State also does not guarantee the truth or accuracy of any statement made in the arguments or rebuttals.

The PROPONENT argument and rebuttal for this measure were prepared by Senator Bob Keenan and Representative Monica Lindeen.

The OPPONENT argument and rebuttal for this measure were prepared by Senator Jerry O'Neil, Representative Larry Jent, and Trevis Butcher.